Dear Misses Brunson and Cibson,

Yourkinteresting letter of 3/20 on the amoultance and stretcheers and the offer prompts me to accept the offers, as of now.

I think it could be helpful to have a memo or just these things, on hand, ready for use. I would like to ask that your include a copy, identified with your names, that I can take to be orlesse when next I got there.

Twould like to to cite the source of everything, at first reference, using, if it is agreeable, the system I use, viz 18H227-3, in parens.

Could you also include all references to the epileptic scizure?

If you can find some way of identifying deduction or conjecture, that, too, could be helpful to others using it. I do not suggest sending such a memo directly to egrison, for he is bossed down and the chances are he'd not see it and it would get into the files. I'd like to tell him what is is, give it to him, and let him read of file it. In either event, he'd know he has it.

Your second puregraph is dediction, not fact, although the deduction may be correct. I refer to the third to the last sentence, the use of the xmds words, "This makes it explicit", etc. You are assuming that under that great pressure and stress there was no error, honest or otherwise. This is what I meen in asking that you distinguish in some way between what you include that is your opinion and schething you cuote, for if Jim were to use something like this in court and it turned out to be wrong it could be quite hurtful to him to what we all want.

Dick Sprague has sent me a copy of his letter to you. I think he has stated remarkably well what I have long felt (may I refer you to WW, Ch. 94). Eyewitnesses to great are unexpected tragedies are often the least dependable sources, and not because they intend to lie.

Dick's letter also makes clear how helpful your work is, and I join him in that also.

Welcome to mary!

Perhaps, sometimes, you can send me pictures of each or the two of you for my files, for the future

Sincerely.